

Appl. No. : 10/646,933  
Filed : August 22, 2003

### REMARKS

In response to the Office Action, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the above-captioned application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following comments.

#### Claim Amendments

Claims 22, 24, 25 and 36 have been amended to correct typographical errors. Claims 27 and 34 have been amended to include limitations similar to those in the allowed claims. New Claims 37-57 are dependent upon allowed claims or upon claims amended to include limitations similar to those in the allowed claims. The claim amendments and the new claims are fully supported by the specification and do not introduce new matter. Support can be found throughout the specification. For example, support for new Claims 37, 38, 43 and 44 can be found at Paragraph 83. Support for new Claims 39 and 45 can be found at Paragraphs 86-88. Support for new Claims 40 and 46 can be found at Paragraph 89. Support for new Claims 41, 47, 53 and 57 can be found at Paragraph 58. Support for new Claims 42, 48, 54 and 58 can be found at Paragraphs 10, 13, 58 and 62.

#### Claim Objection

In the Office Action, the Examiner notes that Claim 36 depends upon a canceled claim. Claim 36 has been amended to depend upon a pending claim, Claim 34.

#### Discussion of Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 27-29 and 34-36 as being obvious over Neilson, U.S. Patent No. 6,639,687, in view of Filion et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,036,361. Applicant respectfully submits that to establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. See M.P.E.P § 2143.03. In response, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art fails to teach or suggest at least one limitation from each of the above-listed claims. In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that Claims 21-25 are allowed over prior art. In response, Applicant has amended independent Claims 27 and 34 to include substantially similar limitations as Claim 21, each having some

Appl. No. : 10/646,933  
Filed : August 22, 2003

variation in scope due to variation in wording. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits in view of the amendment, independent Claims 27 and 34 and their dependent claims are now in condition for immediate allowance.

Summary

Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. In light of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions which may be answered by telephone, he is invited to call the undersigned directly.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: April 18, 2007

By: 

Eric M. Nelson  
Registration No. 43,829  
Attorney of Record  
Customer No. 20,995  
(619) 235-8550

3629406  
040907